

Amendments to the Drawings:

The attached sheets of drawings include changes to Figures 3B and 6. These sheets replace the original sheets.

Remarks/Arguments:

Claims 1 and 8 have been amended. No new matter is introduced herein. Claims 1-8 are pending.

Claims 1 and 8 have been amended to clarify the relationship between the stopper and the terminal. In particular, claims 1 and 8 have been amended to recite that 1) the stopper has adjacent portions that protrude from a surface of the frame where the contact portion of the terminal protrudes and 2) a portion of the terminal is disposed between the adjacent portions of the stopper. No new matter is introduced herein. Basis for the amendment to claims 1 and 8 can be found, for example, at Figs. 2, 3A and 3B of the subject specification.

The drawings have been objected to. In particular, Fig. 6 has been objected to because it does not include a "Prior Art" label. Fig. 6 has been amended accordingly. Applicants respectfully request that the objection to Fig. 6 be withdrawn.

In addition, the drawings are objected to as failing to comply with 37 CFR 1.84(p)(4). In particular, reference character "29" (shown in Figs. 3A and 3B) is objected to because it is "used to designate both stopper and stopper of another embodiment." In Fig. 3B, reference character "29", has been amended as "29'." In addition, the specification has been amended, at the paragraph starting at page 6, line 15, to correspond with amended Fig. 3B. Accordingly, Applicants respectfully request that the objection be withdrawn.

Furthermore, the drawings have been objected to under 37 CFR 1.83(a). In particular, it is asserted that the features of "two surfaces when viewed toward the surface of the frame showing an angle greater than 0 degrees but less than 180 degrees" (recited in claim 5) is not shown in the drawings. Applicants respectfully disagree. Support for the features of claim 5 is specifically described in the subject specification at page 6, lines 20-27 and is shown in Fig. 3A. Accordingly, Applicants respectfully request that the objection to the drawings under 37 CFR 1.83(a) be withdrawn.

Claims 1 and 8 have been provisionally rejected on the grounds of non-statutory obviousness-type double patenting as being unpatentable over claims 1 and

6 of co-pending Application No. 11/570,550. Applicants note that on page 4 of the Office Action, the Examiner refers to U.S. Patent No. 7,362,877, whereas on page 5 of the Office Action, the Examiner refers to U.S. Patent Application No. 11/570,550. Applicants believe that the reference to U.S. Patent No. 7,362,877 is an inadvertent error and that the double patenting rejection relates to the U.S. 11/570,550 application. Applicants request this provisional rejection be held in abeyance. Applicants note for the Examiner that MPEP Section 804(I)(B) states that:

The 'provisional' double patenting rejection should be made by the Examiner in each application as long as there are conflicting claims in more than one application unless that 'provisional' double patenting rejection is the only rejection remaining in one of the applications. If the 'provisional' double patenting rejection in one application is the only rejection remaining in that application, the Examiner should then withdraw that rejection and permit the application to issue a patent, thereby converting the 'provisional' double patenting rejection in the other application(s) into a double patenting rejection at the time the one application issues as a patent.

Claims 1-8 have been rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over Aujla et al. (U.S. 6,860,766) and further in view of Applicants' Admitted Prior Art (AAPA) (page 1, lines 12-20 of the subject specification). It is respectfully submitted, however, that these claims are patentable over the cited art for the reasons set forth below.

Claim 1, as amended, includes features neither disclosed nor suggested by the cited art, namely:

... a stopper having adjacent portions that protrude from a surface of the frame where the contact portion of the terminal protrudes, a portion of the terminal being disposed between the adjacent portions of the stopper wherein the stopper is configured to restrict bending of the sheet metal constituting the terminal within a threshold value of reversibility of a material of the metal.
(Emphasis Added)

Although not identical to claim 1, claim 8 includes a similar recitation.

Aujla et al. disclose, in Figs. 2 and 3, an electrical connector 100 which includes a plurality of "resiliently flexible" electrical contacts 111-114 mounted to housing 102.

Contacts 111-114 are electrically conductive and are "resilient such that the contacts can be compressively engaged to exert a responsive contact pressure." (Col. 3, lines 37-45). As shown in Figs. 3 and 4, connector 100 also includes centrally-disposed cylinder 170 that selectively limits the compressive deflection of contacts 111-114. (Col. 4, lines 10-22).

Aujla et al., however, do not disclose or suggest that a stopper includes adjacent portions that protrude from a surface of a frame where the contact portion of a terminal protrudes such that a portion of the terminal is disposed between the adjacent portions of the stopper, as required by claims 1 and 8 (emphasis added). Cylinder 170 (i.e., a stopper) of Aujla et al. does not include adjacent portions such that contacts 111-114 (i.e., terminals) are disposed between the adjacent portions. Instead, Aujla et al. teach that contacts 111-114 are outside of cylinder 170. In addition, as acknowledged by the Examiner on page 9 of the Office Action, Aujla et al. does not disclose or suggest an electro-acoustic converter including a magnetic circuit, a frame, a diaphragm and a voice coil, as required by claims 1 and 8. Thus, Aujla et al. do not include all of the features of claims 1 and 8.

AAPA discloses, at page 1, lines 12-20 of the subject specification, an electro-acoustic converter including a magnet, a frame, a diaphragm and a voice coil. AAPA, however, does not make up for the deficiencies of Aujla et al. because AAPA does not disclose or suggest a stopper having adjacent portions that protrude from a surface of the frame such that a portion of the terminal is disposed between the adjacent portions of the stopper, as required by claims 1 and 8. Accordingly, allowance of claims 1 and 8 is respectfully requested.

Claims 2-7 include all of the features of claim 1 from which they depend. Accordingly, these claims are also patentable over the cited art for at least the same reasons as claim 1.

Application No.: 10/599,800
Amendment Dated February 4, 2009
Reply to Office Action of November 12, 2008

MAT-8914US

In view of the amendments and arguments set forth above, the above-identified application is in condition for allowance which action is respectfully requested.

Respectfully submitted,



Jacques L. Etkowicz, Reg. No. 41,738
Attorney for Applicants

DMG/so

Attachments: Figures 3B and 6 (2 sheets)

Dated: February 4, 2009

P.O. Box 980
Valley Forge, PA 19482
(610) 407-0700

SO_372707